



## **Steering Committee DRAFT - Recommendations for a Preferred Alternative**

**November 13, 2001**

This memorandum summarizes the draft recommendations of the Steering Committee for a preferred alternative for the I-405 corridor. These recommendations were developed by the committee in response to the I-405 Draft EIS results and public comments during October – November 2001. Committee members prepared individual recommendations that were submitted and subsequently discussed at two Steering Committee meetings on October 23 and November 8, 2001.

19 members participated in the group discussion and voting. When reviewing the attached tabular summary of committee voting, it is important to note that vote totals do not add up to the number of members recorded as present since some members abstained from voting on specific elements, arrived late or left early. In particular, some of the agencies abstained from certain votes due to their concerns regarding environmental impacts and questions regarding the appropriateness of their voting within the committee structure.

The recommendations are divided into the following sections:

- ◆ **Summary of Recommendations** - concise review of the committee recommendations and areas where general consensus was reached followed by committee positions on outstanding issues/elements.
- ◆ **Tabular summary of recommendations and comments**- committee voting summary and comments received from individual committee members.
- ◆ **General conditions of support relating to design and environmental features.** These conditions would apply to all of the program elements and are still in 'draft' form.

## **PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE CONSENSUS ELEMENTS**

*Element numbers correspond with descriptions listed in the I-405 Decision Making Guide mailed to members.*

All members supported inclusion of the following elements in the preferred alternative.\*

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| #1- TDM Package   | #15- Improve Connecting Freeway Capacity to I-405            |
| #2- Transit Expansion                                     | #16- Implement planned arterial improvements                 |
| #4- Arterial HOV Priority                                 | #17- Expand Capacity on North-South Arterials                |
| #5- HOV lanes on I-405 with Direct Access Ramps           | #18- Upgrade Connecting Arterial Connections to I-405        |
| #6- Add Park and Ride Capacity to Match Demand            | #19 -Corridor Pedestrian and Bicycle Improvements            |
| #7- Add Transit Center Capacity to Match Demand           | #20 -Corridor Intelligent Transportation System Improvements |
| #8 - Basic I-405 Improvements                             | #21 -Corridor Freight Enhancements                           |
| #12-Add Collector Distributor lanes on I-405 where needed |  |
| #14-SR 167 / 405 Interchange improvements                 |  |

## **COMMITTEE POSITIONS ON REMAINING PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE ISSUES**

### **Transportation Demand Management (TDM)**

- Pricing Strategies - Members reached consensus on the statement: “Support use-based pricing in region as part of regional strategy.” They acknowledged that the region should examine the pricing feasibility as part of a separate study.

### **Transit**

- A significant majority (15) of the members recommended a Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) service for north-south transit travel in the corridor: “BRT is the preferred strategy. Do not include fixed guideway in preferred alternative; recommend Sound Transit analyze fixed guideway in its Phase II planning.”
  - Fixed-Guideway Transit: Three (3) members supported fixed guideway HCT within the corridor, rather than using bus rapid transit. Fixed guideway was seen as providing long-term sustainability.
  - Commuter Rail: One (1) member supported commuter rail.
- Committee members reached consensus to explore more high capacity transit (HCT) options for the ‘Central Core’ area.
- A significant majority (15) of members supported actively seeking to preserve the use of the BNSF right-of-way for future transportation opportunities (core area future HCT uses; balance for bike-pedestrian uses that support transit and other trip reduction opportunities; and long trails, if part of recommendation). The BNSF was seen to provide bike/pedestrian uses and long-term transit sustainability options. Three (3) members supported setting up a separate study to look at future uses.

\*Resource agencies participating on the Steering Committee abstained on some or all of the 21 elements because of: (1) concerns regarding environmental impacts; (2) difficulty determining environmental impacts by element, and (3) roles and responsibilities in the I-405 decision making process.

## Roadway:

- **I-405 Expansion**
  - *Add 2 Lanes:* A significant majority (14) of committee members recommended adding up to two general-purpose lanes in each direction along I-405.
  - *Add No Lanes:* Two (2) members supported not adding lanes to I-405, citing environmental concerns.
- **Lane Balance: 3<sup>rd</sup> Lane South of I-90** – Members reached consensus not to support adding a third lane south of I-90, citing environmental and community concerns. Collector/distributor and auxiliary lanes were supported.
- **SR 167 Expansion** - A majority (11) supported adding up to two lanes in each direction on SR 167 south to Kent.
  - *Other Committee Views:* Three (3) members supported adding no lanes in each direction on SR 167, citing environmental concerns. For the most part, these persons also opposed the addition of 2 lanes in each direction to I-405.
- **Managed Lanes** – A significant majority (13) of members supported the concept of managing up to two lanes each direction along I-405. Two (2) members opposed it.
- **Utilize Tolls within Managed Lanes** -A majority (10) of committee members supported consideration of toll usage. Three (3) members were opposed to the concept. Members supporting the use of tolls felt they offered the system sustainability and should be studied in more detail.

## Non-Motorized:

- **Bike and Pedestrian ‘Long Trails’:** A majority (7) of members supported including the corridor pedestrian and bicycle facilities (long trails). A minority (3) did not favor the inclusion of long trails.